



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/366,858	08/04/1999	WILLIAM DRENTTEL	HD-100US	3583
43399	7590	08/08/2005	EXAMINER	
EVELYN M. SOMMER 250 PARK AVE RM 825 NEW YORK, NY 10221			HUYNH, THU V	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2178		
DATE MAILED: 08/08/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/366,858	DRENTTEL ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Thu V. Huynh	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-6,8-16,18,20 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3-6,8-16,18,20 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 04 August 1999 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed on 05/23/2005 to application filed on 09/04/1999.
2. Claims 17, 19 and 21 are canceled.
3. Claims 1, 6, 11, 15, 20, 22 are amended.
4. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-16, 18, 20, and 22 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 6, 11, and 15 are independent claims.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: there is missing a comma before the currently added limitation (said operation on sat at least one of ... subdividing). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
 - (b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. **Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-14 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Microsoft FrontPage 98 (herein after FrontPage), copyright 1997 by Sams.net Publishing, pages 359-381, in view of England, US 6,144,991 filed 02/1998.

Regarding independent claim 1, FrontPage teaches Front Page software program provides a template for the display of information, said template having a display area with a dimensional configuration of a height of approximately a first whole number of dimensional units and a width of approximately a second whole number of dimensional units (FrontPage, page 367 line 14 – page 368 line 24; page 363, line 10 – page 364, line 5; and fig. 18.4, many templates such as “Banner and Contents, Footer, Header, Footer and Contents, Vertical Split” template), said template comprising a plurality of grids combined and arranged together to fill the entire display area of said template (FrontPage, page 363, fig. 18.4; page 364, fig. 18.5, each template has different number of frames and layout), wherein grids of desired length-to-width ratio of dimensions are used to form all display components filling the entire display area of said template data structure, such that the grids forming all display components can be readily proportioned by the desired dimensional unit ratio in the template data structure to fit together in whole numbers of dimensional units to fill the entire display area of the template data structure (FrontPage, page 364, fig. 18.5) and the proportioning of said grids is automatically maintained during operation on at least one of the grids of the template data structure to generate a resulting display on computer display devices, said operation on said at least one of the grids being at least one action selected from the group consisting of repositioning, resizing, reshaping, reorienting, and subdividing (FrontPage, page 365 lines 3-22; page 365, lines 23 – page 369, lines 16, user defines desired length-to-width ratio of frames in a frameset and this ratio is automatically

maintained during splitting (subdividing) one of the frame in the frameset to occupy some percentage of the entire frame).

Although the use of only grids being dimensioned to have *approximately a two dimensional unit by one dimensional unit* configuration are not explicitly disclosed, FrontPage implementation obviously use such grids and grids' dimensional information to allow the user to create new frameset and frames, as well as to add (split) and delete frames (FrontPage, page 363 lines 10-22 and page 365 lines 3-22).

England teaches the step of providing predefined different frame layouts and framesets includes grid dimensions (England, col.10, line 53 – col.11, lines 19 and fig.4).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined England and FrontPage to provide “each of said grids being dimensioned to have approximately a two dimensional unit by one dimensional unit configuration”, since this would have provided the user with different template layout configuration.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, FrontPage and England teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. FrontPage teaches wherein at least one of said grids is further subdivided into two sub-grids (FrontPage, page 365 lines 3-13). However, FrontPage does not explicitly disclose each subdivided having an approximately one dimensional unit by one dimensional unit configuration.

England teaches the step of providing different frame layouts and grid dimensions (England, fig.4).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined England and FrontPage to provide “each subdivided having an approximately one dimension unit by one dimension unit configuration”, two-by-one dimensional unit configuration, or any different desired dimensional unit configuration, since this would have provided the user with different layout configuration.

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, FrontPage and England teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. FrontPage teaches wherein said template is provided in a Web authoring program for generating pages for display with a browser program, said grids comprising frames in which information may be entered, through said authoring program and displayed via said browser program (FrontPage, page 359; page 360, lines 1-13; and page 371, lines 1-20, generating web pages for display with a browser program and separately adding/editing the content of a frame page in a full browser window).

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, FrontPage and England teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. FrontPage teaches wherein said template is provided within a software program, said grids comprising frames in which information may be entered to said software program and displayed via said software program (FrontPage, page 359, last paragraph; page 363, line 10 – page 364, line 5; figure 18.4; and page 371-375; Front Page software program provides templates comprising frames to create and edit contents in the frames of web pages in What You See Is What You Get mode).

Claim 6 is for a computer system performing the method combination of claims 1 and 3, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 8-10 are for a computer system performing the method of claims 3-5, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 11, FrontPage teaches a method arranging information, including text and graphic images, in a template having a display area with a dimensional configuration of a height of approximately a first whole number of dimensional units and a width of approximately a second whole number of dimensional units, wherein grids of the desired length-to-width ratio of dimensions are used to form all display component filling the entire display area of said template data structure, such that the grids forming all display components can be readily proportioned desired dimension unit ratio in the template data structure to fit together in whole number of dimensional units to fill the entire display area to the template data structure (FrontPage, page 367 line 14 to page 368 line 24; and page 375, lines 1-20). FrontPage teaches providing at least one template (FrontPage, page 363, line 10 – page 364, line 5; and fig. 18.4, many templates such as “Banner and Contents, Footer, Header, Footer and Contents, Vertical Split” template, each has different number of frames and layout) subdivided into a plurality of grids combined and arranged together to fill the entire display area of said template (FrontPage, page 363, fig. 18.4 and page 378, fig. 18.6), wherein a desired length-to-width ratio of said grids is automatically maintained during operation on at least one of the grids of the template data structure to generate a resulting display on computer display devices, said

operation on said at least one of the grids being at least one action selected from the group consisting of repositioning, resizing, reshaping, reorienting, and subdividing (FrontPage, page 365 lines 3-22; page 365, lines 23 – page 369, lines 16, user defines desired length-to-width ratio of frames in a frameset and this ratio is automatically maintained during splitting (subdividing) one of the frame in the frameset to occupy some percentage of the entire frame).

FrontPage implementation obviously uses such grids and grids' dimensional information to allow the user to create new frameset and frames, as well as to add (split) and delete frames (FrontPage, page 363 lines 10-22 and page 365 lines 3-22). However, FrontPage does not explicitly disclose each subdivided having an approximately two-by-one dimensional configuration.

England teaches the step of providing predefined different frame layouts and grid dimensions (England, col.10, line 53 – col.11, lines 19 and fig.4).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined England and FrontPage to provide “each of said grids has approximate two-by-one dimensional configuration”, one-by-one dimensional unit configuration, or any different desired dimensional unit configuration, since this would have provided the user with different template layout configuration.

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, FrontPage and England teach the limitations of claim 11 as explained above. Refer to the rationale relied to reject claim 11, “providing a plurality of templates, each said template having a different arrangement of grids” is addressed.

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent on claim 11, FrontPage and England teach the limitations of claim 11 as explained above. FrontPage teaches separately entering information into each of said grids such that said template displays different information in said grids (FrontPage, 371-375, separately adding different content to left, top and main frame).

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent on claim 11, FrontPage and England teach the limitations of claim 11 as explained above. FrontPage teaches the template is provided for in a Web authoring program for generating pages for display with a browser program in which information may be entered, through said authoring program and displayed via said browser program (FrontPage, page 359; page 360, lines 1-13; and page 371, lines 1-20, generating web pages for display with a browser program and adding/editing the content of a frame page in a full browser window).

8. **Claims 15-16 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Microsoft FrontPage 98” (herein after FrontPage), copyright 1997 by Sams.net Publishing, pages 359-381 in view of England, US 6,144,991 filed 02/1998 and Courter et al., “Mastering Microsoft Office 2000 Professional Edition”, ISBN:0782123139, Pub. Date: February 1999, pages 105-145; 937-981; and 1031-1056.**

Regarding independent claim 15, FrontPage teaches a method for displaying text and other information on a display, said text information having at least two formats, at least one of said formats having a horizontal directional orientation and at least one of said formats having a

vertical directional orientation (FrontPage, page 367 line 14 to page 368 line 24; page 374, fig. 18.12, text in horizontal direction in top frame and vertical direction on left frame), said method comprising:

- creating a first screen display by dividing the area of the display defined by a first template data structure into first plurality of grids which are combined and arranged together to fill the entire area of the display, wherein grids of desired length-to-width ratio of dimensions are used to form all display components filling the entire display area of said template data structure (FrontPage, page 363, lines 10-16; and 365 lines 3-13, creating frameset using frame template and splitting a frame into two rows or columns), at least one of said first plurality of grids displaying said text information formatted in said horizontal directional orientation, said at least one grid having a horizontal orientation corresponding to the orientation of said textual information format (FrontPage, page 373, text information formatted in horizontal direction in top frame), wherein a desired length-to-width ratio of said grids is automatically maintained during operation on at least one of the grids of the template data structure to generate a resulting display on computer display device, said operation on said at least one of the grids being at least one action selected from the group consisting of repositioning, resizing, reshaping, reorienting, and subdividing (FrontPage, page 365 lines 3-22; page 365, lines 23 – page 369, lines 16, user defines desired length-to-width ratio of frames in a frameset and this ratio is automatically maintained during splitting (subdividing) one of the frame in the frameset to occupy some percentage of the entire frame); and

- creating second screen display by dividing the area of the display defined by a second template data structure into a second plurality of grids which are combined and arranged together to fill the entire area of the display, wherein grids of desired length-to-width ratio of dimensions are used to form all display components filling the entire display area of said template data structure (FrontPage, page 363, lines 10-16; and 365 lines 3-13, creating frameset using frame template and splitting a frame into two rows or columns), each said grid having a horizontal or vertical orientation, at least one of said second plurality of grids displaying said text information formatted in said vertical directional orientation, said at least one grid having a vertical orientation corresponding to the orientation of said textual information format (FrontPage, page 373, text information formatted in vertical direction in left frame), wherein a desired length-to-width ratio of said grids is automatically maintained during operation on at least one of the grids of the template data structure to generate a resulting display on computer display devices, said operation on said at least one of the grids being at least one action selected from the group consisting of repositioning, resizing, reshaping, reorienting, and subdividing (FrontPage, page 365 lines 3-22; page 365, lines 23 – page 369, lines 16, user defines desired length-to-width ratio of frames in a frameset and this ratio is automatically maintained during splitting (subdividing) one of the frame in the frameset to occupy some percentage of the entire frame).

FrontPage teaches that the user enables to configure the size of plurality of frames (FrontPage, page 367, lines 4-17). However, FrontPage does not explicitly disclose each of said first and second plurality grids being only dimensioned to have approximately a two dimensional

unit by one dimensional unit configuration; selecting a first format for text information from at least two format; and displaying said screen having said textual information corresponding to said selected format.

England teaches the step of providing predefined different frame layouts and grid dimensions (England, col.10, line 53 – col.11, lines 19 and fig.4).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined England and FrontPage to provide “grids being dimensioned to have approximately a two dimensional unit by one dimensional unit configuration”, since this would have provided the user with different layout configuration to create desired frames.

However, England does not explicitly disclose selecting a first format for text information from at least two formats; and displaying said screen having said textual information corresponding to said selected format.

Courter teaches the steps of:

- selecting a first format for text information from at least two format (Courter, page 124, lines 15-36 and page 125, fig. 6.12); and
- displaying a screen having said textual information corresponding to said selected format (Courter, page 124, lines 15-36 and page 125, fig. 6.12).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Courter and FrontPage to provide tools for the user to format contents in frames, since this would have facilitated the user to layout an electronic document.

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, FrontPage, England, and Counter teach the limitations of claim 15 as explained above. Refer to the rationale relied to reject claim 15, FrontPage teaches at least one of said grids is further subdivided into two grids (FrontPage, page 365 lines 3-13, subdividing a frame into plurality of frames).

However FrontPage does not explicitly disclose each grid having an approximately one dimensional unit by one dimensional unit configuration.

England teaches the step of providing different frame layouts and grid dimensions (England, fig.4).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined England and FrontPage to provide “each subdivided having an approximately one dimension unit by one dimension unit configuration”, two-by-one dimensional unit configuration, or any different desired dimensional unit configuration, since this would have provided the user with different layout configuration to create a desired frameset.

9. Claims 18, 20 and 22 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft FrontPage 98 in view of England as applied to claims 1, 6 and 11 as explained above, and further in view of Hargove, US 5,371,847, patented 1994.

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent on claim 1, FrontPage and England teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. However, Frontpage does not explicitly disclose that

the template is provide at the level of the operating system and said grids comprising frames in which programs can be displayed.

Hargrove teaches a method and system provides a grid template for the display of information, said template having a display area with a dimensional configuration of a height of approximately a first whole number of dimensional units and a width of approximately a second whole number of dimensional units, said template comprising a plurality of grids combined and arranged together to fill the entire display area of said template (Hargrove, col.3, lines 23-58 and figures 1 and 8A-12B, displaying templates 8A and 11A comprising grids, each template has different number of frames (rows and columns), said template is provide at the level of the operating system and said grids comprising frames in which programs can be displayed (Hargrove, figures 1, 3-4, 6 and 8A-13B, the layout of fig.9B used for window arrangement of an operating system user-interface in Fig.1 in which programs, such as “Microsoft Word” and “Program Manager” can be displayed).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hargrove into FrontPage and England to provide the templates to both the level of operating system user-interface and a particular application, since this would have facilitated the user to manipulate of arrangement of windows for displaying programs in an operating system as well as information or documents in a web page.

Claim 20 is for a computer system performing the method of claim 18 and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 22, which is dependent on claim 11, teaches similar limitations of claim 18 and is rejected under the same rationale.

10. Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 11-13, 15-16 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courter et al., “Mastering Microsoft Office 2000 Professional Edition”, ISBN:0782123139, Pub. Date: February 1999, pages 105-145; 937-981; and 1031-1056.

Regarding independent claim 15, Courter teaches a method for displaying text and other information on a display, said text information having at least two formats, at least one of said formats having a horizontal directional orientation and at least one of said formats having a vertical directional orientation (Courter, page 124, line 1 – page 125, line 3), said method comprising:

- creating a first screen display by dividing the area of the display defined by a first template data structure into first plurality of grids which are combined and arranged together to fill the entire area of the display, wherein grids of desired length-to-width ratio of dimensions are used to form all display components filling the entire display area of said template data structure (Courter, page 121, line 8 – page 122, line 11), each of said first plurality grids being dimensioned to have any dimensional unit configuration (Courter, page 121, line 35 – page 122, line 7, specifying exact measurements and formatting for the table by setting height/width of plurality grids when creating the table. This discloses that plurality grids dimensioned one- by-one, two-by-one, or any desired dimension), at least one of said first plurality of grids

displaying said text information formatted in said horizontal directional orientation, said at least one grid having a horizontal orientation corresponding to the orientation of said textual information format (Courter, page 123, lines 3-6; page 124, line 15 – page 125, line 3), wherein a desired length-to-width ratio of said grids is automatically maintained during operation on at least one of the grids of the template data structure to generate a resulting display on computer display devices, said operation on said at least one of the grids being at least one action selected from the group consisting of repositioning, resizing, reshaping, reorienting, and subdividing (Courter, page 135, last paragraph – page 136, user defines desired length-to-width ratio of grids in the table and this ratio is automatically maintained during splitting (subdividing) a selected cell); and

- creating second screen display by dividing the area of the display defined by a second template data structure into a second plurality of grids which are combined and arrange together to fill the entire area of the display, wherein grids of desired length-to-width ratio of dimensions are used to form all display components filling the entire display area of said template data structure (Courter, page 121, line 8 – page 122, line 11), each of said second plurality of grids being dimensioned to have approximately a five dimensional unit by two dimensional unit configuration, each said grid having a horizontal or vertical orientation (Courter, page 121, line 35 – page 122, line 7, specifying exact measurements and formatting for the table by setting height/width of plurality grids when creating the table), at least one of said second plurality of grids displaying said text information formatted in said vertical directional orientation, said

at least one grid having a vertical orientation corresponding to the orientation of said textual information format (Courter, page 123, lines 3-6; page 124, line 15 – page 125, line 3), wherein a desired length-to-width ratio of said grids is automatically maintained during operation at least one of the grids of the template data structure to generate a resulting display on computer display devices, said operation on said at least one of the grids being at least one action selected from the group consisting of repositioning, resizing, reshaping, reorienting, and subdividing (Courter, page 135, last paragraph – page 136, user defines desired length-to-width ratio of grids in the table and this ratio is automatically maintained during splitting (subdividing) a selected cell);

- selecting a first format for said text information from said at least two format (Courter, page 124, lines 15-36 and page 125, fig. 6.12); and
- displaying said screen having said textual information corresponding to said selected format (Courter, page 124, lines 15-36 and page 125, fig. 6.12).

Courter does not explicitly disclose using only two-dimensional unit by one-dimensional unit. However, Courter teaches that any desired grids dimension is configured to apply to the displayed table as discussed above, which suggests the use of only grids dimensioned one-by-one, two-by-one, or any desired dimension are also configured by the user.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included grids with two by one dimensional unit, since it would have provided the user with different layout configuration to create a desired table.

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, Courter teaches the limitations of claim 15 as explained above. Courter teaches at least one of said grids is further subdivided into two sub-grids (Courter, page 134, lines 10-21 and fig. 6.20, splitting a grid (cell) into many grids (cells) which includes into two grids (cells)).

Claims 1 and 11 recites the limitation similar to claim 15 and are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Courter teaches wherein at least one of said grids is further subdivided into two sub-grids (Court, pages 133, “Merging and Splitting Cells” section – page 134, lines 10-21 and fig. 6.20). Court does not explicitly disclose each subdivided having an approximately one-dimensional unit by one-dimensional unit configuration. However, Courter teaches that any desired grids dimension is configured to apply to the displayed table as discussed above, which suggests the use of only grids dimensioned one-by-one, two-by-one, or any desired dimension are also configured by the user.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included grids with two by one dimensional unit, since it would have provided the user with different layout configuration to create a desired table.

Claim 6 is for a computer system performing the method combination of claims 1 and 3, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 8 is for a computer system performing the method of claim 3 and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, Courter teaches providing a plurality of templates, each said template having a different arrangement of grids (Courter, page 121, line 8– page 122, line 11; pages 135-136).

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent on claim 11, Courter teaches separately entering information into each of said grids such that said template displays different information in said grids (Courter, page 123, “Entering and Editting text” section, separately adding different content).

11. **Claims 18, 20, 22 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courter as applied to claims 1, 6 and 11 as explained above, and further in view of Hargove, US 5,371,847, patented 1994.**

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent on claim 1, However, Courter does not explicitly disclose that the template is provide at the level of the operating system and said grids comprising frames in which programs can be displayed.

Hargrove teaches a method and system provides a grid template for the display of information, said template having a display area with a dimensional configuration of a height of approximately a first whole number of dimensional units and a width of approximately a second whole number of dimensional units, said template comprising a plurality of grids combined and arranged together to fill the entire display area of said template (Hargrove, col.3, lines 23-58 and

figures 1 and 8A-12B, displaying templates 8A and 11A comprising grids, each template has different number of frames (rows and columns), said template is provide at the level of the operating system and said grids comprising frames in which programs can be displayed (Hargrove, figures 1, 3-4, 6 and 8A-13B, the layout of fig.9B used for window arrangement of an operating system user-interface in Fig.1 in which programs, such as “Microsoft Word” and “Program Manager” can be displayed)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hargrove into Counter to provide the templates to both the level of operating system user-interface and a particular application, since this would have facilitated the user to manipulate of arrangement of windows for displaying programs in an operating system as well as information or documents in a web page.

Claim 20 is for a computer system performing the method of claim 18 and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 22, which is dependent on claim 11, teaches similar limitations of claim 18 and is rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 05/23/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that Frontpage “fails to teach, the automatic maintenance of length-to-width ratios of the frames when one or more frames are subject to an operation of the second type” and “does not teach at all how to automatically maintain the aspect ratio (length-to-width ratio) of the frames when they are operated upon (second type), rather it teaches how to keep the widths and heights of frames at constant preset values or maintain a preset ratio between the width of the frame and the width of the display window and separately maintain a preset ratio between the width of the frame and the width of the display window”.

This is not persuasive. Frontpage teaches “Split Frame command in the Frame menu to split a frame into two rows or two columns” and “[u]se the Percent setting when you want the width or height of your frame to **always be a percentage** of full browser width or height” (Frontpage, page 367, lines 14 – page 368, lines 10). For example if a frameset includes two frames in 50%. The grids ratios which form these two frames do not change (must always be the same) when the user splitting (subdividing) one of these two frames in rows or columns. Therefore, Frontpage’s teaching still perfectly matches what applicant claimed.

Applicants argue that “Courier does not teach the automatic maintenance of length-to-width ratios of the grids/cells of the table when grids/cells are subjected to the operation of the second type”.

This is not persuasive. Courier teaches creating a desired length-to-width ratio of grids in a table. Courier teaches splitting (subdividing) a selected cell in the table (Courier, page 134, lines 10- 21 and fig.6.20) resulting a horizontal or vertical will be displayed in the selected cell, while said grids (grids before splitting) of said table do not change.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ilsar, US 6,694,487 B1, filed 12/1998, teaches multi-column page preview using a resizing grid.

Langford-Wilson, US 6,589,292 B1, filed 03/1999, teaches electronic publishing system.

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu V Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TVH
August 2, 2005

William S. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
8/4/2005